

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**Docket No. 020732-214.539
Appl. No.: 10/827,395**JUL 25 2007****Section II. (REMARKS)**

The pending claims in the application are claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8.

Amendment to claims 1, 3 and 8

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite that the composition "consists essentially of" the enumerated elements. The "comprising" language has been replaced with "consisting essentially of" language without prejudice. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, and particularly at paragraph [0022]. Claim 1 was further amended to include the limitations of previously pending claim 2. In addition, the reducing agent reinserted into claim 1 was present in claim 1 as initially filed and examined. As such, no new matter has been cited herein and no new search is necessitated.

Election/Restrictions

In the May 25, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner withdrew claims 6, 28, 29 and 31 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicants acknowledge same and request reconsideration of said claims upon allowance of the claims from which said withdrawn claims 6 and 31 depend.

Rejection of Claims and Traversal Thereof

In the May 25, 2007 Office Action:

claims 1-3, and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,893,995);

claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 4,036,731);

claims 1-4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,565,616); and

claims 1-5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Teich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,867).

Docket No. 020732-214.539
Appl. No.: 10/827,395

These rejections are traversed and reconsideration of the patentability of the pending claims is requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

1. In the May 25, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,893,995) (hereinafter Thomas). Applicants traverse said rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite:

“A SCF-based removal composition consisting essentially of at least one supercritical fluid (SCF), at least one co-solvent, and at least one reducing agent, wherein the at least one reducing agent comprises at least one of hydrogen gas, formic acid, formaldehyde, formalin, boranes, diboranes, amine stabilized boranes, amine stabilized alanes, and tetraalkyl amines of BH_4 and AlH_4 , and wherein the at least one SCF comprises a fluid selected from the group consisting of carbon dioxide, oxygen, argon, krypton, and xenon.”

Thomas relates to the deposition of a catalyst compound on a catalyst support using a supercritical-like solvent. The catalyst compound, such as a metallocene catalyst, is dissolved in the solvent to form a catalyst solution, the catalyst support is contacted with the catalyst solution, and the solvent is removed leaving a deposited catalyst on the catalyst support.

As noted, presently pending claim 1 has been amended to recite a supercritical fluid based removal composition consisting essentially of at least one SCF, at least one co-solvent and at least one reducing agent.

It is well established as a matter of law that the transitional phrase “consisting essentially of” limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps “and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)” of the claimed invention. *In re Herz*, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976) (emphasis in original).

Clearly, the presence of a catalyst compound, e.g., a metallocene compound, will materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended herein, is not

Docket No. 020732-214.539

Appl. No.: 10/827,395

anticipated by Thomas. Moreover, there is no reason that one skilled in the art would even consider Thomas, which relates to deposition, for compositions for the removal of material.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw its rejection of claims 1-3, 7, and 8 as being anticipated by Thomas.

2. In the May 25, 2007 Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin (U.S. Patent No. 4,036,731). Applicants traverse such rejection.

Martin relates to a process for the hydrogenative extraction of coal using a solvent having a critical temperature between 150°C and 450°C, including water, hydrocarbons, and organic derivatives of hydrocarbons (see, Martin, the sentence bridging columns 2 and 3).

As introduced hereinabove, claim 1 recites a SCF-based composition, wherein the at least one SCF comprises a fluid selected from the group consisting of carbon dioxide ($T_c = 31^\circ\text{C}$), oxygen ($T_c = -118.6^\circ\text{C}$), argon ($T_c = -122.3^\circ\text{C}$), krypton ($T_c = -63.8^\circ\text{C}$), and xenon ($T_c = 16.6^\circ\text{C}$).

Comparing Martin and applicants' claim 1, it can be seen that Martin does not expressly or impliedly teach the inclusion of applicants' SCF's. Moreover, there is no reason that one considering Martin would consider using any of the SCF's enumerated in applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw its rejection of claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 as being anticipated by Martin.

3. In the May 25, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,565,616) (hereinafter Li). Applicants traverse such rejection.

Li discloses a method requiring the use of supercritical or near critical water to produce alkanes from an alkyl bound to a heteroatom.

As introduced hereinabove, claim 1 recites a SCF-based composition, consisting essentially of at least one SCF, at least one co-solvent and at least one reducing agent, wherein the at least one SCF comprises a fluid selected from the group consisting of carbon dioxide, oxygen, argon, krypton, and xenon. Clearly,

Docket No. 020732-214.539
Appl. No.: 10/827,395

the presence of supercritical water will materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention. Moreover, the presence of the alkanes and/or alkyl bound to a heteroatom will also affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended herein, is not anticipated by Li. Moreover, there is no reason that one considering Li would consider using any of the SCF's enumerated in applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw its rejection of claims 1-4, 7, and 8 as being anticipated by Li.

4. In the May 25, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Teich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,867) (hereinafter Teich). Applicants traverse such rejection.

According to the Examiner, Teich teaches various suitable drying solvents including alkanols, carbon dioxide, ammonia and formaldehyde.

Teich actually recites that:

"drying fluids whose critical data is not too high, in order to avoid more expensive apparatuses, are used as a convection stream or medium during the drying. Suitable drying fluids are ammonia, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur hexafluoride; alkanes, such as propane, butane, pentane, hexane and cyclohexane; alkenes, such as C₁-C₇-n-, iso-, neo-, secondary or tertiary alkenes, e.g. ethene or propene; alkanols, such as methanol, ethanol, n-propanol, isopropanol or butanols; ethers, such as dimethyl or diethyl ether or tetrahydrofuran; aldehydes, such as formaldehyde or acetaldehyde; ketones, such as acetone; esters, such as the methyl, ethyl, n-propyl or isopropyl esters of formic, acetic or propionic acid; amines, such as mono-, di- and trimethyl- or -ethyl- or n- or isopropylamine or mixed alkylated amines thereof; and mixtures of two or more of these fluids." (see, Teich, col. 4, lines 46-61) (emphasis added)

and that:

"In addition to said drying fluids, supercritical carbon dioxide is also suitable for the drying fluid." (see, Teich, col. 5, lines 2-3)

Docket No. 020732-214.539
Appl. No.: 10/827,395

The latter recitation does not expressly state that the CO₂ may be mixed with at least one of the former enumerated solvents. Claim 6 of Teich further clarifies this by reciting:

"A process as claimed in claim 5, wherein the drying fluids used are C₁ - C₆ -alkanols, C₁ -C₆ -ethers, C₁ -C₆ -ketones, C₁ -C₆ -aldehydes, C₁ -C₆ -alkanes, C₁ -C₆ alkenes, C₁ -C₆ -esters or C₁ -C₆ -amines or carbon dioxide." (see, Teich, claim 6) (emphasis added)

In other words, Teich does not expressly or impliedly teach that the supercritical CO₂ may be included with the other enumerated solvents such as alkanols and formaldehyde.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that to be anticipatory, the elements in the prior art reference must be arranged as required by the claim. See, *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Teich does not satisfy this standard. Accordingly, Teich does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw its rejection of claims 1-5, 7, and 8 as being anticipated by Teich.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8 are in form and condition for allowance. Authorization is hereby given to charge any deficiency in applicable fees for this response to Deposit Account No. 13-4365 of Moore & Van Allen PLLC. If any additional issues remain, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (919) 286.8090 to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted

Date: July 25, 2007

By: Tristan A. Fuierer

Tristan Anne Fuierer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 52,926
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
Phone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199
Email: fuierert@mvalaw.com